

**Lackenhach**  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
ATTORNEYS SINCE 1923 **Siegel LLP**

AUG 05 2005

Lackenhach Siegel Building  
One Chase Road  
Scarsdale, New York 10583  
U.S.A.

Phone: (914) 723-4300  
Fax: (914) 723-4301  
E-Mail: RBAUER@LSLLP.COM

**FACSIMILE COVER SHEET****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**


Applicant(s): Juha PIRKOLA et al  
Serial No.: 09/337,330  
Filing Date: June 21, 1999  
Title: MOBILITY WITHIN A PACKET-SWITCHED TELEPHONY  
NETWORK  
Examiner: Jean Gelin  
Art Unit: 2681  
Docket No.: NOKIA.33US  
Customer No.: 43829

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile No. (571) 273-8300, and is addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on August 5, 2005.

Signature  
Name

  
: ROBERT M. BAUER

Transmitted herewith:

1. Request for Complete Office Action

Total No. of pages transmitted, including this sheet: 3

CONFIDENTIAL: This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are

AUG 05 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO. 6173/33US

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant(s): Juha PIRKOLA et al  
Serial No.: 09/337,330  
Filed: June 21, 1999  
Group: 2681  
Examiner: J. GELIN  
For: MOBILITY WITHIN A PACKET-SWITCHED TELEPHONY  
NETWORK

August 5, 2005

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REQUEST FOR COMPLETE OFFICE ACTION**

Sir:

Applicants gratefully acknowledges the outstanding Office Action dated July 5, 2005. It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action is incomplete because it fails to respond to applicants' arguments traversing the obviousness rejections.


In the Amendment filed on January 26, 2005, applicants provided separate arguments on pages 10-11 traversing the obviousness rejections of claims 4, 11, 24 and 35 in the first Office Action. In particular, applicants disputed the alleged teachings of the secondary references applied in the rejections. The outstanding Office Action does not respond to these arguments and does not change the rejections except to utilize a different primary reference. Applicants' arguments are not moot and are still relevant (and equally applicable) to the repeated obviousness rejections which still rely on the same secondary references.

## ATTY DOCKET NO. 6173/33US

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the Office Action is incomplete for these reasons and requests that the Office Action be supplemented or corrected to be complete. Applicants also request that the time period for filing a response be reset from the mailing date of any such supplemental or corrected Office Action. See MPEP 710.06.

Please charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 10-0100 (NOKIA.33US) and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. Bauer, Registration No. 34,487  
Lackebach Siegel, LLP  
One Chase Road  
Scarsdale, NY 10583  
Tel.: (914) 723-4300  
Fax: (914) 723-4301